Case Number

88-943

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUN 28 1988
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

IN THE

United States SUPREME Court

FALL TERM 1988

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JOHN G. BARROW JR.
Plaintiff - Apellant - Petitioner
vs.
H. RAY WALKER
Defendant - Appellee - Respondant

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI FROM THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, ELEVENTH CIRCUIT ATLANTA, GEORGIA

John G. Barrow Jr.
A Layman without legal education
Rt. 1 Box 470
Callahan, Florida 32011
(904) 845-2475

DECISION MAKERS NOTES

IN THE (1)
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543

JOHN G. BARROW JR

Plaintiff-Appellant-Petitioner

VS

H. RAY WALKER,

Defendant-Appellee- Respondant

****

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

##########

a) * * QUESTIONS PRESENTED TO BE REVIEWED

QUESTION NUMBER ONE: Does the term per annum mean a Time Peroid of one year ? Year by Year ?

****

QUESTION NUMBER TWO: Does interest accrue year by year to the unpaid balance, year by year, if not paid ? In this Case there has been absolutely no answer to any averment to

any Complaint, Fed. Rules Civ.Proc. Rule 7(a)

Appellant has had no opportunity to be heard, there has been no responsive pleadings. F.R.C.P. Rule 8(d).

No day in court.

QUESTION NUMBER THREE: Was the District Court decision of dismissal without any adjudication of any issue, an abuse of discretion ? 92 S Ct @ 2605 and 2609.

****

On the 5th day of April, 1985, Judge Wm Terrell Hodges consolidated all 12 seperately filed Actions into one Gommed up Conspiracy. Judge Hodges did assign to Judge Hodges, all 12 cases.

QUESTION NUMBER FOUR:

Without any evidentiary hearing, was the consolidation of Hodges " ALL OF THESE CASES" an abuse of discretion ? SEE: Edwards v E.I. DuPonte, 183 F 2d 165 (5th Cir).

****

The Magistrate, Harvey E Schlesinger with no record of any proceedings in Written Form indicating any evidence, or any reasons relied upon in reaching his conslusion did upon his own "Say-So" only, make the decision that Sanctions were appropriate, with no Rule 42(b) Procedure,absolutely no evidentiary hearing and no jury. Schlesinger /Hodges has since inflicted $80,677.47 in judgments upon this pro se person.

QUESTION NUMBER FIVE: Was this Cruel and Unjust Punishment ? See: Doanldson v Clark,786,F 2d 1970 11th Cir.

See: Also; Jones v Bales, 58 F.R.D. 453, (ND.) Ga. 1972 aff'd 480 F 2d 805 (5th Cir 1978)

The Court Holds:

" " Pro se litigants are not subject to the unusal incentives against filing repetitive, frivolous or malicious lawsuits" They are immune from imposition or costs. If they are un-successful and because of their poverty they are practically immune from later tort actions for " Malicious prosecution or abuse of process"

****

Barrow v Walker, being consolidated with other Cases, by Judge Hodges into one Gommed up mess, those Cases are constantly scrambled with All other Cases. In most of these cases the Magistrate's recommendation does boast:

" Counsel obtained the results sought; dismissal of the case prior to trial, and relief from immediate harassment of the suit"

QUESTION NUMBER SIX: Does this confession by a Central figure in this Wheel

Within A Wheel Conspiracy , constitute "an Admission of INTENT" to inflict a felonious injury upon this pro se person, in collusion with others ?

Commonwealth v Hunt , 45 Mass (4Met) 111, 123, (1942) (Shaw C.J.) Biskind v U.S., 281 Fed. 47 Cir (1922). Monroe v Pape, 365 U.S. 167,

****

QUESTION NUMBER SEVEN: Was this an abuse of discretion ?

****

In the Instant Case the 11th Circuit court affirmed the District Court's dismissal,which was Void,because of having been reached without Due Process of Law.

QUESTION NUMBER EIGHT:Was the 11th Circuit's affirmance of this Void decision and also an abuse of discretion ? U.S.C.A. Const. Amend.5 and 92 S.Ct,@ 2605.

****

QUESTION NUMBER NINE: As related to this Action, does the review of the " entire record";

a) apply to the Court of First Instance only ? or (b) To all Courts ?

Monroe v Pape,356, U.S. 167;

****

QUESTION NUMBER TEN: Is one misstep decisive to the expedition of a proper decision on the Merits, with no Open Forum and without any opportunity to be heard ? Conley v Gibson 78 S.Ct.99;

and is this pro se person entitled to an opportunity to be heard ?

****

QUESTION NUMBER ELEVEN:If this pro se person is sent by this court , back down to the bottom of the hill, to

begin anew, at the same place of beginning of this action , and the same biased and prejudiced Court, would this pro se Person have even as much as a prayer ?

****

QUESTION NUMBER TWELVE : This Petitioner respectfully Urges this Court to determine Whether or Not, this pro se person in asking for Redress of Grievances, well grounded in law, and well grounded in fact is entitled to be heard, to examine the evidence, confrontation of Witnesses and a "92 S.Ct.@ 2605 record" or, is Cruel and Unjust Punishment ALL THAT THERE IS ? Had this pro se Person prevailed, would he also receive $80,677.47 in Reciprocity ? (attorneys fees)

b) * * PARTIES TO PROCEEDING IN THE COURT WHOSE JUDGMENT IS SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED

1) H. Ray Walker

2) Marlin M Feagle, Attorney for H. Ray Walker. P.O. Box 1653, Lake City, Florida 32056

3) John G. Barrow Jr Rt 1 Box 470 Callahan, Florida 32011

In this Case and Controversy, there has been many FEDERAL QUESTIONS that have been completely ignored. The same as if not even submitted herein. The Eleventh Circuit has sanctioned and does condone and affirm dismissal without Due Process of Law, without protection of the law equal to that afforded others.

Without some record of each proceeding and the Decisionmaker's

conclusion set forth in written form indicating any evidence, except that of Schlesinger's own "Say-So" nor any reason except Defendants:

" Counsel obtained the results sought; dismissal of the case prior to trial, and relief from the immediate harassment of the suit"

In Morrissey v Brewer, 92 S,Ct,@ 2605; The Supreme Court Holds:

" Moreover, in each Case the decisionmaker must be impartial, there must be some record of the proceedings, and the decisionmaker's conclusions must be set forth in written form indicating both the evidence and the ressons relied upon, because of the Due Process Clause requires these proceedings"

There can be volumes of Case Law presented to emphasize the Court of First Instance, departure from the accepted and usual course of Judicial proceedings. To say nothing of the

11th Circuit condoning the des-

crepencies by their affirming " dis-

missal" repugnant to the Due Process

of Law Clause and repugnant to the

Protection of the Law Clause, of our

Constitution.

This is Raw !

This is Bitter !

This does Stink !

Then the Central Figures in the Wheel

Within A Wheel Conspiracy call for San-

ctions, $80,677.47 to be inflicted upon

this pro se person, only because this

pro se person, is a Pro se person.

In Jones v Bales, 58 F.R.D. 453 (N.D. GA 1972) affid 480 F 2d 805 (5th Cir 1978)

"Pro se litigants are not subject to the unusual incentives against filing repetitive, frivolous or malicious lawsuits. They are immune from imposition or costs.

If they are unsuccessful, and because of their poverty they are practically immune from later tort actions for 'malicious prosecution or abuse of process "

All of the above and more illegal acts and discrepencies in procedure, does call, ever so loudly, for the exercise of THIS COURTS POWER OF SUPERVISION.

The most Asinine and Repugnant aspect of this Case and Controversy is the very attitude of the Central Figures and their co-conspirators in this Wheel Within A Wheel Conspiracy. Defendants Counsel;

" Obtained results sought; dismissal of the case prior to trial, and relief from the immediate harassment of the suit"

Schlesinger and Hodges are so independent and impartial, Schlesinger's Boasting of Success on behalf of his defendant co-horts obtaining relief, with a Complete Absence

of any answer to any averment, no responsive pleading, no hearing on the issues, no confrontation of the Adverisaries, absolutely no Due Process of law, is so Asinine, as to constitute an admission of corruption in our Federal Court System. Need more be said ?

Yes, a Lot More. An Appeal in the 11th Circuit afformance of this RAW GUT infliction by the " Judge Handling Wahl/Hodges District Court" of the Overt Sanctions amounting to a total of to date, $80,677.47 in Cruel and Unjust Sanctions Plus absolutely no opportunity to be heard and no Morrissey v Brewer 92 S.Ct.@ 2605, record is so unconscionable as to provoke violance, of a Very Hideous Nature. So Heinous as to litterly rape our Constitution of these United States of America.

So egergious as to defy any description by any verbage. As out and out admission of Conspiracy of the Most Overt Nature !

SEE: Commonwealth V Barnes, 107 Pa. Super 46 162 A 670 675.

CREATION OF REMEDY

" In a case of actual controversy within its jurisdiction except with respect to Federal Taxes, any court of the United States and the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, upon filing an appropriate pleading, may declare the rights and other relations of any interested party, seeking such declaration shall be sought. Any such declaration shall have the Force and Effect of a final judgment or decree and shall be reviewable as such"
28 U.S.C.A. § 2202

FURTHER RELIEF

Further relief necessary or proper relief based on a declaratory judgment of decree may be granted after reasonable notice and hearing against any adverse party whose rights have been determined by such judgment.

SEE: Also; 28 U.S.C.A. § 2106

TABLE OF CONTENTS
S.Ct. Rule 33.5 (a)

	PAGE
Questions presented to be Reviewed	1thru 7
Parties to Proceeding	8
Federal Questions	2,3,5,7,8 22,27,33
Central Figure Schlesinger's Confession	9
Creation of Remedy and Further Relief	13
Statement of Case	15 thru 18
Problems that have arisen	19 thru 23
Review of Judgment Dated the 17th day of Sept, 1987, included in the Appendix 79, 80, 81 and page 83 thru 88	24 thru 37

INDEX OF AUTHORITY
S.Ct.Rule 33.5 (b)

	PAGE
Article III § 2	15
Biskind v U.S. 281 Fed 47 Cir (9122)	5
Boddie v Conn. 91 S Ct 780	28
Conley v Gibson 78 S Ct 99	6
Commonwealth v Barnes 107 Pa. Super 46 162 A 670 675	13
Commonwealth v Hunt 45 Mass (4Met) 111, 123 (1942 (Shaw C.J.)	5
Donaldson v Clark 786 F 2d 1970 (11th Cir)	3
Edwards v E I DuPonte 183 F 2d 165 (5th Cir)	3
Fed. Rule Civ-Proc Rule 7(a)	2,36
Fed, Rule Civ.Proc Rule 8 (d)	2
Fed. Rules Civ. Proc Rule 54 (c)	18
Florida Statute Ch 197.056 (2)	19,23
Florida Statute Ch 197.0151	23

INDEX OF AUTHORITY
S.Ct.33.5 (b)

	PAGE
Grannis v Brewer 34 S Ct 779	28
Grannis v Orden, 34 S Ct 779	29
Jones V Bales 58 F.R.D. 453 (ND.) Ga 1972) affid 480 F 2d 805 (5th Cir 1978)	10 , 4
Monroe v Pape 365 U.S. 167	5,6
Morrissey v Brewer 92 S Ct @ 2605	7,9,12, 28 29,30
Power of Supervision S Ct Rule 17.1 (a)	35
S Ct Rule 15.1 (h)	35
S Ct Rule 21-1 (j)	35
S Ct Rule 24	37
U.S.C.A. Const. A 5	5,27,28,29 30, 31,36,
28 U.S.C. § 1343 (3) 28 U.S.C.A. § 1343 (3)	15
28 U.S.C.A. § 2106	13

The subject matter set forth in the Com-(15).
plaint does arise under the Constit-
ution of these United States and is
within 28 U.S.C. § 1343, U.S.C.A.
§ 1343

Article III § 2 of the Federal Const-
itution provides that:

" The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity arising under this Constitution the laws of the United States and Treaties made or shall be made under their authority"

It is clear that the Cause of Action is one which " arises under" the Federal Constitution.
Since the Complaint plainly sets forth a Case arising under the Constitution the subject-matter is within the Federal Judicial power defined in Art. III § 2, and so within the power of Congress to assign to the jurisdiction of the District Court. Congress has exercised that power in 28 U.S.C. § 1343 (3) U.S.C.A. § 1343 (3)

" The District Court shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action authorized by law"

g)(16)* STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This Case and Controversy has arisen as a results of over two hundred loans made to the State of Florida, County of Columbia, by the individual upon the request of the State.

2) There are but two parties involved in each loan.

(a) The Agent for the State, requesting the loan.

b) The individual or his Agent accepting the offer of the State by the Granting of the loan, to the State Agent. There is no third party. The land owner never gives his consent.

3) These loans are witnessed by individual loan contracts that are commonly called " Tax Certificates"

4) These instruments, the loan con-

tracts, are freely given to witness the terms and conditions of the loans.

5) It is only a Myth that the "contract for loan" " Tax Certificate" if you perfer, is sold like that of a Lottery Ticket.

6) The Loan Contract specifically spells out the principal amount of the loan and the rate of interest per annum (each year) that is agreed upon by the parties, the Lendor and the Lendee.

7) As security for each loan," The Loan Contract" offers and spells out the description of a parcel of land whose tax is delinquent.

8) Any reading and reasonable thinking person,understands that the owner of the delinquent property

is not a party to the loan.

9) The loan is actually a Punitive measure, authorized by laws of Florida to support the function of Government.

10) The owner of property offered as security for the loan never gives his consent to offer his real property as security, or to issue the loan contract.

11) The loan contract (tax certificate) is a two party affair always.

Fed Rules Civ. Proc. Rule 54 (c)
28 U.S.C.A.

" Under the Federal Rules Plaintiff pleads facts and not law, and the law is to be applied by the Court"

" A Plaintiff cannot be deprived of his rights without a trial, even if the trial promises to be long and burdensome".

PROBLEMS THAT HAVE ARISEN

1) As any other Contract for a loan, the Contract can be assigned to another lender.

2. The Agent for the State, The Tax Collector who is always the lendee is in the Office for four years.

4. The laws of Florida provide that the Tax Collector is the borrowing party as well as the sole JUDGE and JURY as related to any discrepency.

See: Florida Statute Chapter 197.056 (2) (1975) (1977) and 197.0151 Lien for taxes.

"(2) A lien created through the sale of a tax certificate (loan contract) may not be foreclosed or enforced in any manner except as prescribed in this chapter " this truely unconstitutional. That is, by the political whims of the Tax Collector acting as "Judge and Jury" completely devoid of any due

process of law.

5) Defendant H. Ray Walker never repays any loan as per the terms of the individual contract.

(a) Defendant Walker does not demand the return of the contract, therefore same cannot be cancelled.

b) Defendant Walker does pay as little as Eight-Tenths of one percent of the amount of interest required to be paid by the rate agreed upon and stated in the Contract. See page 172 and 173 Appnd.

(c) As a matter of fact, some of the Contracts that belong to this Plaintiff have been paid to other individuals because of Malice, Scienter and Enmity, of Defendant Walker.

(d) Defendant Walker will not give

an itemized account of the interest earned by the forebearance of the money detained.

(e) Defendant Walker will not give an accounting for the loan contracts held on hand by this Plaintiff and enumerated on the Exhibit "E-1" Page 182 of the Appendix.

(f) Defendant Walker when repaying each loan apparently uses no mathematical formula. He pays just what figure that pops up in his mind.

(g) The amount of the injury in dollars and Cents caused by Defendant Walker to this plaintiff, can never be accurately determined, however, if Defendant Walker would complete the Form Exhibit " E-1" of the appendix. As an example the results would demonistrate the

manner in which Defendant Walker is impairing the obligation of State Contracts. See Page 182 of the Appendix and Page 183 .

(h) This accounting would also conclusively show an astronomical amount of property (cash due plaintiff) being taken and held in an illegal manner, repugnant to the Constitution of these United States, violating the Taking Clause of the Fifth Amendment, as incorporated against the Statutes by the Fourteenth Amendment Jurisdiction 479 ---- (1986).

(i) The implementation of the laws of Florida as related to the Contract of loans by and between the State and the individual lenders constitutes an out and out scheme by the State of

extortion, when in fact there is no relief in the State Courts except as provided bt Florida Statute Chapter 197.056 (2) (1975) and 197.0151 which puts the Fox Guarding The Hen House. It is the intention of the State that the so-called " Tax Certificate" is not a Good-faith loan contract, then in that event the instrument should be entitled.

(a) " A Badge of Fraud" intended to be hassled in a Court of Law.

(b) " A FOOLS LOTTERY" conditioned upon a public sale two years later.

(c) " AN INTEREST BEARING PAPER" that may or may not earn interest by the month, times the number of months, if and when paid, if ever repaid ?

h) * * REVIEW OF JUDGMENT

1) This Case and Controversy was submitted to the Court of First instance for a judicial determination, of;

1) When an instrument expresses that interest is to be paid at a given rate per annum, is THE TIME PEROID, year by year, whether paid or not ?

2) When an instrument expresses a Stated Rate of interest per annum, does the interest accrue to the unpaid balance, year by year, if not paid, even though this arrangement by acquiescence runs on and on for twenty (20) years ?

3) The Defendant alleges that the interest is to be calculated:

" The stated rate of interest divided by 12 times the number of months"

Whether it be 6 months or 200 months.

4) The entire record speaks for itself.

5) The above questions are the Cause of Action, and the reason why this case and controversy presents questions so substantial as to require plenary consideration with Briefs on the Merits and Oral Argument for their resolution.

Some of the Special and Important reasons for this Petition for Certiorari are:

(a) Question Number 1: Above, " Time Peroid".

(b) Question Number 2:Above, " Interest Accuring"

(c) The alleged proceedings in the Court of First Instance.

(d) The Alleged proceedings in the

11th Circuit Court of Appeals.

(e) The filthy corruption so glearing obvious in Our Federal Court system.

****

(a) and (b) ARE OBVIOUS

Let us review (a) and (b) above. The answer thereto is ever so obvious however, there has been no answer of any kind or nature from the Defendants, the court of First Instance, or the 11th Circuit there must be a consummation of same, as relief guaranteed by our Constitution demands, at least some sort of adjudication as there are questions that have arisen.

Then too, they are Federal Questions for the reason that the Sleasy calculation of interest to the contrawise

results in the taking of property without full and just compensation repugnant to the Taking Clause of Our Constitution, a Federal Question. In addition thereto, there is an Impairing of Obligation of Contract, another Federal Question.

(c) ALLEGED PROCEEDING IN THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE

1) This Petitioner filed a Complaint the 4th day of February 1985, .There has been no answer to any averment. NO RESPONSIVE PLEADING.

2) On the 5th day of April, 1985, the Honorable W.T. Hodges cut off this Petitioners access to Court, with no Jurisdiction.

This decision was reached without Due Process of Law U.S.C.A. Const Amend 5.

(28)
No notice of Hearing Grannis v Brewer 34 S.Ct. 779;
Boddie v Conn, 91 S.Ct.780;

No Written Form indicating any evidence or reason relied upon. Morrissey v Brewer, 92 S.Ct.@ 2605.

And W.T. Hodges did assign " All of these Cases" to W.T. Hodges the 7 th day of August, 1985. Then W.T. Hodges consolidated " All of these Cases" in definance of the 5th Circuit's Edwards v E.I. DuPonte, Denemour and Co. et al, 183 F 2d 165.

On the 28th day of January, 1986, the 11th Circuit vacated Hodges ruling, however, this made little difference. The Order of the 5th day of February, 1986, was handled the same as before the Mandate of the 11th Circuit. On

the 15th day of August 1986, the decisionmaker Harvey E Schlesinger ruled again. With no Jurisdiction this decision was reached without due process of law. U.S.C.A. Const. Amend 5. No notice of hearing Grannis v Orden, 34, S.Ct 779.

No written Form indicating any evidence or reasons relied upon. Morrissey v Brewer 92 S.Ct,@ 2605.

On the 27 th day of August 1986, W.T. Hodges as decisionmaker, ruled again with no jurisdiction. This Decision was reached without Due Process of Law. U.S.C.A. Const. Amend 5.

No Notice of Hearing, Grannis v Orden 34 S.Ct.779.

No Written Form indicating any evidence or reasons relied upon. Morri-

issey v Brewer[30], 92 S.Ct.@ 2605.

On the 17th day of September 1987, W.T. Hodges decisionmaker, ruled again, with no jurisdiction.

This decision was reached without Due Process of Law. U.S.C.A. Const Amend 5.

No Notice of hearing, Grannis v Orden 34 S.Ct.779.

Boddie v Conn,91 S.Ct.780.

No Written Form indicating any evidence or reasons relied upon. Morrissey v. Brewer 92 S,Ct.@ 2605.

See Exhibit Pages 79 and 80 of the Appendix.

In the same fashion on the 20th day of April 1988, the Eleventh Corcuit Court of Appeals as decisionmaker ruled again with no jurisdiction,this decision was reached without due process of law

U.S.C.A. Const. Amend 5.

No notice of hearing Grannis v Orden 34 S.Ct.779.

Boddie v Conn. 91 S.Ct.780. See Exhibit on Page 81 of the Appendix.

Ever so Galling is the Exhibit which states:

" * * DECISION BY COURT: this action came to trial, or hearing before the court, the issues have been tried or heard and a decision has been rendered"

THIS IS A DIRTY DOG LIE ! Please check the Docket. * * * There has been no trial or hearing (not behind the black curtain) . Please check the docket.

* * * There has been no issues tried or heard (not behind the black Curtain) Please check the Docket.

This decision was reached without Due Process of Law. U.S.C.A. Amend 5.

No notice of hearing Grannis v Orden 34 S.Ct.779.
Boddie v Conn, 91 S.Ct.780.

No written Form indicating any evidence or reasons relied upon . Morrissey v Brewer, 92 S.Ct.@ 2605.

Was Chief Judge William Terrell Hodges Decision Void because of being reached without any resemblance of due process of law ? What really hurts is that the 11th Circuit condones, affirms and approved this corruption, promulgated by the Wheel Within A Wheel conspiracy of the Federal Courts and " COUNSEL OBTAINED THE RESULTS SOUGHT; DISMISSAL OF THE CASE PRIOR TO TRIAL, AND RELIEF FROM THE IMMEDIATE HARASSMENT OF THE SUIT"

Quote: Harvey E Schlesinger in collusion with Wm T. Hodges and (Judge Handling) Wahl, all of whom have sworn to uphold the Constitution of our United States

and perfer to;

" OBTAIN RESULTS SOUGHT; DISMISSAL OF THE CASE PRIOR TO TRIAL, AND RELIEF TO THE DEFENDANTS OF THE SUIT , in preference to Equality and Justice for All .

****

Petitioner asks this Honorable United States Supreme Court ---- is this lack of Due Process , this deprivation of Equal Protection of the Law, this taking of property , this impairing of obligation of Contract, this conspiracy, this corruption in Our Federal Court System, a Federal Question ?

****

Should this Goings-on be settled by this United States Supreme Court ? Does this departure from other judicial proceedings call for Supervision of this Honorable Supreme Court's

Power of Supervision ?

This romance described above, and the Hodges consolidation of " ALL OF THESE CASES" is a Prelude to the infliction of Eighty-thousand, six hundred, Seventy seven and 47/100 dollars. $80,677.47 in Cruel and Unjust Punishment to this Petitioner, who is forced to live in poverty, the bottomless pits of poverty in a 20 year old "wood burning" Mobile Home with very little income and handicapped, unable to work and 72 years old.

Then too, because of "adverse pre-trial publicity world wide in the Media", this pro se Person cannot retain any law Firm, even if he had the Deep Pockets which he has not. See: Barrow v Reed pending in Hodges Kangaroo Court.

Rule 21-1 (j) The preceeding pages are self explainatory as to:

1) Special and Important reasons begging for this Honorable Courts plenary Consideration. S Ct Rule 15.1 (h).

2) The obvious corruption in or Federal Court System is certainly a Federal Question not to mention the other Federal Questions contained herein. S Ct 17.1(c)

3) The decisions reached upon the decisionmaker's " own "Say-so", without any evidence and without any reason relied upon is certainly not the accepted and usual Course of Judicial Procedure. S Ct 17.1 (a).

This Case and Controversy truly mendicates for this United States Supreme Court to exercise this Court's Power of Supervision S Ct Rule 17.1 (a)

4) There has been Federal Questions timely and properly raised so as to give this Supreme Court Jurisdiction to review the Judgment on a Writ of Certiorari See: S.Ct.Rule 21.1 (h)

5) Included in the Appendix herewith is the only Opinion, Orders, Judgments etal Whose decision is sought to be reviewed, including the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed Sanctions of the lower courts void decision. See: U.S.C.A. Const Amendment 7 and Amendment 5, U.S.C.A. Amendment 7. 92 S.Ct.2605 and 78 S Ct 99

6) The 11th Circuits has by their Mandate Dated 5/12/88 certified that the Federal Court Systems denial of redress to this pro se constitutional rights shall be denied. That no opportunity to be heard shall be granted.

No Federal Questions will be adjudicated wherefore, S.Ct.Rule 24 provides for;

" This (U.S. Supreme) Court * * * may consider and decide the entire matter in controversy.See: 28 U.S.C. § 1254 (3)

Should this Court find it desirable to do so, this Petitioner offers to Amend this Petition.

All decisions of " All of these cases" should be held unlawful and set aside for reasons set forth in 5 U.S.C. § 706 (2) and because of all decisions being reached without Due Process of Law, including " No Opportunity to be heard"

Petitioner Moves this Court to Grant Relief if by no other authority than;

28 U.S.C.A. § 2202

28 U.S.C.A. § 2106.

This Petitioner has never seen Hodges much less been before him in Open Forum or otherwise.

The only decisionmaker that this Petitioner has been before is that of Schlesinger, the Magistrate who has " SOUGHT RELIEF FOR ALL DEFENDANTS" in connection with the Wheel Within A Wheel conspircy and " Relief from harassment of the Suit" as related to the Defendants, in lieu of upholding the Constitution of our United States of America.

Respectfully Submitted

JOHN G. BARROW JR
A layman without legal education
Rt 1 Box 470
Callahan, Florida 32011
(904) 845-2475

AFFIDAVIT OF A PETITION for
A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF NASSAU

Before me this day personnally appeared JOHN G. BARROW JR, who being duly sworn deposes and says, that I did deposit in a United Parcel Service Three true copies of this Petition for Certiorari with First Class Postage paid thereon, addressed to Marlin M Feagle Post office Box 1653, Lake City, Florida 32056 Counsel for H. Ray Walker, this 10th day of November, 1988.

JOHN G. BARROW JR
A Layman without legal education
Rt 1 Box 470
Callahan, Florida 32011
(904) 845-2475

Before me personnally appeared John G. Barrow Jr, to me well known and known to me to be the person described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and acknowledged to and before me that he executed said instrument for the purposes therein expressed. Witness my Hand and Official Seal this 10th day of November A D. 1988.

Alma M Barrow
Notary Public
State of Florida

Notary Public, State of Florida
My Commission Expires Nov. 20, 1988
Bonded Thru Troy Fain-Insurance, Inc.

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543

JOHN G. BARROW JR

Petitioner,

VS.

H RAY WALKER

Respondant,

****

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI BY A
PERSON APPEARING pro se

##########

Comes Now, Plaintiff-Appellant- Petitioner in Barrow v Walker requesting leave to file this Petition for Writ of Certiorari as a Person Appearing pro se.

This Petitioner has tried for years to obtain Counsel, in Jacksonville, Florida, in other parts of Florida, in

Georgia, New Jersey, New York, Philadelphia, Utah and Texas.

On one occasion Petitioner was told by Race Horse Haines, of National Reputation in Dallas Texas,that it would cost $5,000.00 for Attorney Haines to look into such an arrangement. The money Order was mailed to Mr Haines, who in a few weeks returned the Money Order for $5,000.00 expressing his regrets, but no thanks.

You see, the problem is that the News Media has Smutted and Smeared thisPlaintiff Appellant, Petitioner without mercy world wide,for acts not committed by this Petitioner, however all attorneys who express a reason state that their Public Relations will not stand Petitioners adverse publicity.

Specifically and to the point in this case there is and never has been anything but Good-Faith shown by this Petitioner while presenting to the best belief and best effort shown for a pro se Person to exhibit in giving this Honorable Court a First hand View of this Fraud being perpetrated on this pro se Person.

This pro se Person does have the same Constitutional demand for protection of the law as is afforded others involved, with all others in the States of this great United States.

Respectfully Submitted

I HEREBY CERTIFY this 10th day of November 1988, that I did furnish a true copy of the above, to Counsel of Record.

JOHN G. BARROW JR
A Layman without legal education
Rt 1 Box 470
Callahan, Fl. 32011
(904) 845-2475